## **MINUTES**

## UTAH RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGIST, ASSISTANT, AND PRACTICAL TECNICIAN LICENSING BOARD MEETING

## March 22, 2012

Room 402 – 2nd Floor –1:00 p.m. Heber Wells Building Salt Lake City, UT 84111

CONVENED: 1:00 ADJOURNED: 2:36

Bureau Manager: Clyde Ormond

**Board Secretary:** Yvonne King

**Board Members Present:** Rex Christensen– Chairperson

Alexis Nieves Loy Ann Hunt Ruth Potkins Stephen Brown Judy Nielson

Heather Parker Hatch

Board Member Absent John Bell

Visitors Dalta M. Quan

Tauna Lee Berry

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Approval of the October 6, 2011 Board Meeting Ms. Hunt seconded by Mr. Nieves made a motion to approve the January 12, 2012 Board Meeting Minutes as

written. The motion carried unanimously.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:** 

Radiologic Technologist Licensing Board Minutes March 22, 2012 Page 2 of 4 Exemptions / Fluoroscopy

Mr. Christensen presented a list of all the states that have licenses under Radiology which included Radiation Therapy, Limited X-ray Machine Operators, Nuclear Medicine Technology, Fusion Imaging, Radiologist Assistant, Magnetic Resonance, Mammography, Songraphy, Computed Tomography, Cardiovascular Technologist and Flouroscopy. The list also included those states that do not have a licensure.

Mr. Christensen was concerned that the Fluoroscopy exam which exists with ARRT could be obtained and with little experience could enable an individual to operate a Flouroscopy machine.

Mr. Christensen made it clear that he did not want a fluoroscopy license or the exam recognized in the state of Utah because it opens up the opportunity for an individual who has the limited license to obtain the Fluoroscopy license. Alaska already recognizes the exam. Mr. Christensen asked for the Board's input.

Dr. Brown then asked the Board if a physician was present to supervise could an assistant operate the fluoroscopy machine.

Mr. Ormand read under the physician practice act which indicated that a medical assistant could do anything under the physician's direct supervision, but was unclear whether the APRN or the PA had that same authority.

Mr. Ormond suggested different avenues the Board could explore (1) Turn to the associations to open up the Practice Act to take legislative action or develop new language in the rule to see who they want to exempt. (2) Seek the opinion of the Attorney General's office and (3) Have an attorney look at the statute to obtain a legal opinion.

The bottom line Mr. Christensen was concerned with was why we have licensure if an individual can be hired off the street and after a little training can operate the fluoroscopy machine under a doctor's supervision. It was Mr. Christensen's proposal to be pro-active and make sure this does not happen in Utah.

It was noted that the Medical Association would not be in favor of too many restrictions in those situations.

Mr. Christensen reviewed the ASRT training curriculum that was discussed at the previous meeting.

Ms. Hunt reviewed the limited x-ray machine operator curriculum. This provides recommendations of the hours



American Society of Radiologic Technologist (ASRT) Training Program

needed for each area which Ms. Hunt recognized as being about 1,000 hours.

Mr. Ormond was unsure if the Division even had the rule making authority to approve any education curriculums.

Ms. Hunt seconded by Mr. Nieves made a motion to propose a recommendation to the Division to review the LXMO Curriculum especially on page two to see if there is rule making authority for approval and if there was to then incorporate the curriculum into the rule. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ormond submitted a sample of the (delegation of services agreement) other professions have prepared for the Board's review.

Mr. Ormond stated that the Board should request a model agreement be submitted from the associations, have their attorney look at it then Mr. Ormond would post it on the web-site.

Mr. Christensen assigned Ms. Hatch to address the issue. Ms Hatch stated the act already shows in detail how the contract should be written. Ms. Hatch suggested not submitting the agreement on the web-site due to the fact that each agreement could vary.

Ms. Hatch seconded by Ms. Hunt made a motion to post 58-54 304 (2) on the web-site and allow the RA and physicians to agree upon their own delegation of services agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ormond stated that the Division will usually audit two percent of the licensees during a renewal cycle.

Dr. Brown seconded by Ms. Hunt made a motion to propose a 10% audit of all licensees in the radiology profession for their continuing education. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ormond reviewed the current investigative report with the Board. This included one received case, one assigned case, one administrative sanction order, one administrative stipulation, two cases closed and one open case.

The Open and Public Meetings Act Power point presentation has been canceled due to no overhead projector. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting

RA Delegation of Services Agreement

Audit Percentages on Continuing Education

Investigation report

Open and Public Meetings Act Power Point

## Meeting Adjourned

2:36

Note: These minutes are not intended to be a verbatim transcript but are intended to record the significant features of the business conducted in this meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily shown in the chronological order they occurred.

Chairperson, Radiology Technologist Licensing Board Date Approved Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational & Professional Date Approved Licensing A Walting Forthall